EXHIBIT A

1 ,

```
Argument
     08inargn
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
1
2
     ALLAN APPLESTEIN TIEE FBO,
3
     D.C.A. GRANTOR TRUST,
                                        New York, N.Y.
                     Plaintiff,
                                        03 Civ. 6268 (TPG)
5
     THE PROVINCE OF BUENOS AIRES,
                     Defendant.
                                              August 18, 2010
                                              3:15 p.m.
10
10
11
     Before:
11
                           HON. THOMAS P. GRIESA,
12
12
                                              District Judge
13
13
                                APPEARANCES
14
1.4
15
     WACHTEL & MASYR
           Attorneys for Plaintiff
15
     BY: HOWARD KLEINHENDLER
16
16
      CLEARY GOTTLIEB
17
          Attorneys for Defendant
17
         CARMINE BOCCUZZI
18
           RAHUL MUKHI
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

Argument 08inargn What I am saying is at this point I am allowed to test that assertion. I don't have to rely on seven words in a 2 translated declaration by somebody in Buenos Aires to tell me don't worry, this bond offering, this half a billion dollar bond offering has nothing to do with the United States when, 5 one -- and it is not disputed by the other side -- Bank of 6 America has been hired to manage it. They say in their papers 7 that the United States securities laws will be affected by it, and we know that the SEC laws only come into effect if the bonds are securities that are offered on a United States 10 So what I'm asking for at this point, Judge, is very 12 limited discovery to find out, one, what's the deal with Bank 13 of America. I want to see the contract. I want to see the 14 economic terms with Bank of America, who is identified as the 15 manager of the bond offering and whose role has not been 16 disputed by any of the papers in front of you today. 17 THE COURT: I know the defense will bring this up, but 18 just to save time, you are seeking, as I understand it, 19 attachment and/or execution and/or restraining orders, right? 20 MR. KLEINHENDLER: And discovery, correct. 21 THE COURT: And discovery. 22 I think you have a judgment or judgments, right? 23 MR. KLEINHENDLER: Correct. 24 THE COURT: So it would really be execution. I think 25 SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

Argument 08inargn the FSIA mixes it up a little bit, but anyway it's attachment 1 and/or execution and then the state law restraints, right? 2 3 MR. KLEINHENDLER: Correct. THE COURT: How can there be any of that process where 5 there is no asset right now? Is there any asset right now to be attached or 6 7 executed against or restrained? MR. KLEINHENDLER: The answer is no. But I am allowed 8 under New York state law, which applies when I'm enforcing a 9 federal judgment, to have discovery to seek out where those 10 assets may be, and I have sufficiently identified what assets 11 12 I'm looking for. THE COURT: I don't think you have any evidence that 13 there are assets that may be in being now. The fact is that 1.4 the assets you are talking about may come into being, but this 15 isn't a matter of getting discovery about where some assets may 16 be that are hidden or obscured in some way. There are no such 17 assets now. How can there be any process? 18 Let's suppose you had discovery, a lot of discovery 19 about what is going to go on in the future and you came back 20 with the results of that discovery. There would be nothing 21 still to attach. 22 MR. KLEINHENDLER: There would be, Judge, because 23 there would be ultimately the bond proceeds. 24 THE COURT: Ultimately is ultimately. Right now there 25 SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

1

3

5 6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

08inargn Argument are no such assets in being. It is possible under some other procedure under state law that somebody might come in and be able to get some kind of injunctive relief tieing up something that might occur in the future, but that isn't what you are applying for now. So I don't see that there is a basis for the Court to act here. MR. KLEINHENDLER: The Court has jurisdiction to fashion discovery, and it's under Rule 26 which can apply here, in the way it sees fit. I don't believe the statutes are supposed to put us in a hide and seek catch me if you can. THE COURT: Let me just interrupt you again. I will assume that there will be at some point this bond offering. And I agree with you that that statement is not conclusive as far as the Court is concerned that there won't be some assets in the United States, that there won't be some buyers in the United States who would deposit money into a United States entity. . I don't think that possibility is precluded by what is represented here, at least for the purposes of the Court, but that's something that may or may not happen in the future. I want to emphasize the may not. It may not. But it seems to me you have to come in and you have to make a showing of some assets in the United States or else something to indicate the reasonable probability that there are assets in the United States. If you did that, I think you could have discovery.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300